

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

un

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/686,893	10/16/2003	Hidetoshi Ishida	YAO-3990US3	8582	
23122 RATNERPRES	7590 04/26/2007 STIA	,	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 980	CE DA 10492 0090	JEFFERSON, QUOVAUNDA			
VALLET FOR	GE, PA 19482-0980	· ·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2823		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		04/26/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

,						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/686,893	ISHIDA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner -	Art Unit				
	Quovaunda Jefferson	2823				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Marc	h 23, 2007.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8 and 12</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8 and 12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
			-			
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal I					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

Application/Control Number: 10/686,893

Art Unit: 2823

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 23, 2007 has been entered.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no description in the specification as

•

Application/Control Number: 10/686,893 Page 3

Art Unit: 2823

originally filed of "evaporated and lifted-off". There is only seen description of "vapor deposited and lifted off".

3. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for "vapor deposited and lifted-off", does not reasonably provide enablement for "evaporated and lifted-off". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to making the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. There is no description of "evaporated and lifted off" as discussed above and therefore insufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to determine suitable process to achieve the instant application.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kita et al, US Patent 5,907,470.

Art Unit: 2823

5. Regarding claims 8, Kita teaches a semiconductor device having a titanium material layer 5 and a silicon oxide layer 2, the titanium material layer includes at least one material selected from the group consisting of BaTlO<sub>3</sub>, SrTlO<sub>3</sub>, Ba<sub>x</sub>Sr<sub>(1-x)</sub>TiO<sub>3</sub>, and similar Group IIA metal titanate (column 4, lines 53-55), the titanium material is provided between an upper electrode 6 and a lower electrode 4, and from a top view, the titanium material layer is longer than the upper electrode (figure 1).

Kita fails to teach a material for the upper electrode is evaporated on the titanium material layer and lifted off.

However, according to the MPEP, Section 2113, "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process".

In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted) (Claim was directed to a novolac color developer. The process of making the developer was allowed. The difference between the inventive process and the prior art was the addition of metal oxide and carboxylic acid as separate ingredients instead of adding the more expensive pre-reacted metal carboxylate. The product-by-process claim was rejected because the end product, in both the prior art and the allowed process, ends up containing metal carboxylate. The fact that the metal carboxylate is not directly added, but is instead produced in-situ does not change the end product.).

7. Regarding claim 12, Kita teaches from a top view, the lower electrode 4 is longer than the titanium material layer 5 (figure 1).

Kita fails to teach a material for the lower electrode is evaporated on the silicon oxide layer and lifted off.

However, according to the MPEP, Section 2113, "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process".

In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted) (Claim was directed to a novolac color developer. The process of making the developer was allowed. The difference between the inventive process and the prior art was the addition of metal oxide and carboxylic acid as separate ingredients instead of adding the more expensive pre-reacted metal carboxylate. The product-by-process claim was rejected because the end product, in both the prior art and the allowed process, ends up containing metal carboxylate. The fact that the metal carboxylate is not directly added, but is instead produced in-situ does not change the end product.).

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8 and 12 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/686,893

Art Unit: 2823

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quovaunda Jefferson whose telephone number is 571-272-5051. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7AM to 3:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



FERNANDO L. TOLEDO PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 6